

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed April 6, 1994. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Claims 2 and 16-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, and 10 have been amended and Claims 21-26 have been added in order to clarify and further describe various inventive concepts. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

The drawings stand objected to because all diagrammatic blocks are not labeled to indicate contents or function. Proposed corrections to the drawings are attached herewith. Applicant respectfully requests approval of the proposed drawing corrections by the Examiner.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Oliver, Jr. Claims 2 and 16-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Independent Claim 1 recites "said processor capable of being programmed to generate said infrared code in order to operate any brand of said television monitor." By contrast, the Oliver, Jr. reference generates a wired fixed code to select one of sixteen different channels that cannot be programmably altered to operate any brand of television set. Additionally, there is no generation of an infrared code in the Oliver, Jr. reference, merely wire connections to transmit electrical signals. See column 3, line 62 to column 4, line 3 of the Oliver, Jr. reference.

Further, Independent Claim 10 recites "said infrared code operating said television monitor to perform said specific function other than tuning said television monitor to a specific channel." New claims 21-26 expand on the types of specific functions that can be performed in the present invention. By contrast, the Oliver, Jr. reference can merely tune a video display to a specific channel through wired connections and cannot perform other specific functions on a television monitor

through infrared transmission as disclosed in the present invention.

Also, many of the dependent claims include elements or functions not disclosed within the Oliver, Jr. reference. For example, Claim 4 discloses a timer for controlling an interval of the specific function. Claim 13 discloses displaying selected images on a picture in picture window of the television monitor. Claim 15 discloses different operating modes of the processor. The Examiner has not identified any of the above or examples from other dependent claims as being disclosed in the Oliver, Jr. reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 11, 13-15, and 21-26 are not anticipated by the Oliver, Jr. reference.

Claims 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Oliver, Jr. in view of Tatsumi. Claims 1 and 10, from which Claims 9 and 12 depend, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Oliver, Jr. reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 12 are patentably distinct from the Oliver, Jr. - Tatsumi combination.


Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1, 3-15, and 21-26.

With the cancellation of Claims 2 and 16-20 without prejudice or disclaimer and the presentation of Claims 21-26, no additional filing fees are due.

An extension of one (1) month is requested and a Notification of Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 with the appropriate fee is attached hereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker & Botts, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER & BOTTS, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Charles S. Fish
Reg. No. 35,870

2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6507
August 8, 1994